BEFORE THE STATE OF INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 2006

ORIGINAL

PROCEEDINGS

in the above-captioned matter, before the Indiana Civil Rights Commission, Barry Baynard, Chairman, taken before me, Lindy L. Meyer, Jr., a Notary Public in and for the State of Indiana, County of Shelby, at the Richmond Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 50 North Fifth Street, Richmond, Indiana, on Friday, November 17, 2006 at 2:09 o'clock p.m.

William F. Daniels, RPR/CP CM d/b/a
ACCURATE REPORTING OF INDIANA
12922 Brighton Avenue
Carmel, Indiana 46032
(317) 848-0088

APPEARANCES: 2 COMMISSION MEMBERS: 3 Barry Baynard, Chairman Charles D. Gidney 4 Steven A. Ramos Tehiji G. Crenshaw 5 6 INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION By Gregory Kellam Scott, Director/Secretary 7 & Christine Cde Baca, Dep. Director Indiana Government Center North 8 100 North Senate Avenue, Room N103 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 9 On behalf of the Commission. 10 OTHER COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT: 11 Robert D. Lange 12 Eric Chandler Cindy Haynes 13 14 ALSO PRESENT: Ron Chappell 15 Ron Church Theresa Satterfield 16 Rose Dangerfield Bob Hunter 17 Paul Kriese Josh Williams 18 19 20 21 22 23

2:09 o'clock a.m. November 17, 2006

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: I'd like to call to order the Indiana Civil Rights Commission meeting, November 17th, 2006. For the record, Commissioners present is Comm. Gidney, Comm. Crenshaw, Comm. Ramos, and I'm Comm. Baynard.

Do we have any additions to the agenda?

MR. LANGE: A couple of things.

Under C, New Business, it should say "2008"

instead of "2007," and you should probably delete, under F, "Hancher v[ersus] Quail Run Apartments."

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Since we don't have minutes to adopt, we'll move on to B, Financial Report.

MR. SCOTT: Commissioners, we have Mr. Eric Chandler, who is a staff accountant who prepares the reports. He's here today, and rather than belaboring that report from the view of an attorney, I'll let him respond to any questions you might have as to the agency's

finances.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Any questions?

MR. SCOTT: Did you receive copies?

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. SCOTT: Comm. Baynard, if you're agreeable, in light of the fact that you have not had those with the materials that were sent out otherwise, Mr. Chandler will walk you through the financial information.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Yes, please.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ SCOTT: And then if there are any questions that arise --

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Yes.

MR. CHANDLER: Okay. This is a report as of the month ending October 31st. On the following page, you'll see that we have a summary of all of the balance sheet accounts for all -- for each of the fund balances, the operating account through the settlement escrow, and our total fund agency balance as of October 31 was 633,741.

The following pages give you the breakdown of each fund, the appropriations, and the balance

a

of each fund at the end of October 31st, along with any disbursements that have occurred year to date.

The following pages behind that would give you any pie graph breakdown of the disbursements that you need to see percentage-wise. As you can see, most of the accounts haven't had much activity. The operating account is sitting at 420,851 at the end of October 31; the age case fund is sitting at a balance of negative four; the EEOC account at 2,621; the ICRC workshops or continuing legal education a 29,603. The posted NAOHRW Conference at 1,176; HUD grant, 145,351; the Home grant at 24,732; the FHIP grant at a negative 1,904; MLK Holiday Commission at 2,784; the settlements escrow at 8,531; which gives you a net of 633,741, and that's all as of October 31, 2006.

MR. SCOTT: With respect to the NAOHRW Conference, which we just recently held, we had transferred \$5,000 in funds to support that effort, and to the extent that there are moneys left over, those funds will be transferred

back into the accounts from which they were provided.

And I will mention that we did have what was a successful conference, and the attendees seemed to enjoy their opportunity to continue their training in terms of their investigative work, as well as the public policy issues that have been raised most recently.

COMM. RAMOS: So, most of the education is in the springtime with the funds that are left there? Is that where most of the disbursements occur?

MR. SCOTT: I apologize. I'm not certain what portion of the --

COMM. RAMOS: Oh, on the ICRC Workshops -- oh, those are posted by the month. That's right.

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

COMM. RAMOS: That's right.

MR. CHANDLER: Uh-huh.

MR. SCOTT: Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: No. Thank you.

MR. SCOTT: You're welcome.

1 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Moving on to New 2 Business, memorandum of proposed 2008 CLE and 3 meeting dates? 4 MR. LANGE: Any comments? The reason 5 for this is: Getting rooms at the Conference 6 Center, the better rooms, you need to get your 7 requests in early. The -- this proposal follows 8 the usual pattern for when we hold Commission 9 meetings, and it's just getting a date specified 10 so I can make a request for rooms on those dates. 11 MR. SCOTT: And I assume we're not 12 necessarily asking for actual action today, in 13 light of the fact, especially, since three 14 Commissioners are not here. 15 MR. LANGE: Well, we could always 16 change. 17 MR. SCOTT: For --18 MR. LANGE: Well, what I would 19 suggest is you go ahead and take the action, I'll 20 resubmit the memo, and if there's any specific 21 problem --22 MR. SCOTT: That's fine. 23 MR. LANGE: -- we can change that.

can't imagine we'll have a lot. 2 MR. SCOTT: They were in my 3 materials. I hope they were in yours. If not, 4 then I think you need to make sure you check your 5 calendars. Maybe the first two months go ahead 6 and approve, and then have a chance to just make 7 sure -- and I say that only with respect to 8 assuring our ability to have the quorums and --9 MR. LANGE: This is for 2008. 10 MR. SCOTT: Yes, I know that. 11 MR. LANGE: Okay. 12 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a motion, 13 then, to approve the CLE and meeting dates? COMM. RAMOS: So moved. 14 COMM. GIDNEY: Second. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor? 17 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye. 18 COMM. RAMOS: Aye. 19 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye. 21 Opposed? 22 (No response.) 23 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Then having no Old

Business or Consent Agreements, we'll move on to 2 F, proposed findings of facts, conclusions of law 3 and order. In the case of Garner versus 4 Jeffersonville Housing Authority and Philip Bates, Executive Director, is there a motion to 5 6 approve this order? 7 COMM. RAMOS: So moved. 8 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a second? 9 COMM. GIDNEY: Second. 10 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor? 11 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye. 12 COMM. RAMOS: Aye. 13 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye. 14 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye. 15 Opposed? 16 (No response.) 17 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And in the case of 18 Chambers versus Becich, is there a motion? 19 COMM. GIDNEY: In the case of 20 Chambers versus Becich, I move that the 21 Commission enter an order that overrules 22 Complainant's objections, overrules Respondent's 23 objections, and adopts the findings of fact,

conclusions of law and order proposed by the Administrative Law Judge in his findings of -- proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and order.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a second?

COMM. RAMOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor.

COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.

COMM. RAMOS: Aye.

COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye.

Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Other Orders.

Cagle versus Orange County Farm Bureau Cooperative and Associates [sic].

MR. LANGE: On this one, Mr. Chair, I think you have copies of motions and things that were filed in this case in your packet. I didn't have a chance to get the order written before the packet went out, but I have one now that would grant this motion and enter a stay, actually a little bit longer than that motion, until a week

after the next Commission meeting. What they're 2 saying is they've got a settlement but they've 3 got some i's to dot and some t's to cross at the 4 Board meeting, so --5 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: So, we can hold 6 that until --7 MR. LANGE: No, you can go ahead and 8 enter it, but then if a settlement doesn't come 9 through in December, then they have a date 10 shortly after the December meeting by which to 11 act. 12 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Can we just hold 13 it off until December, then, and we'll get a 14 chance to read it? 15 MR. LANGE: Except that it looks sort of like they should be doing something now, and 16 17 this grants the right to not file anything until 18 after the Commission meeting. 19 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Okay. Then do we 20 have a motion, then, to approve? 21 COMM. CRENSHAW: So moved. 22 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Second? Is there 23 a second?

COMM. GIDNEY: Second. 2 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor? 3 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye. 4 COMM. RAMOS: Aye. 5 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye. 6 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye. 7 Opposed? 8 (No response.) 9 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Reports by 10 Commissioners for Appeals Cases. Is there a 11 report from Comm. Carter? 12 MR. SCOTT: We have nothing. 13 MR. LANGE: We have not -- do you 14 have one? 15 MR. SCOTT: Do you have it? 16 MS. HAYNES: He brought them in 17 yesterday. Tawanda has them. 18 MR. LANGE: Do you know what the 19 result is? 20 MS. HAYNES: No --21 MR. LANGE: Okay. 22 MS. HAYNES: -- but he took them to 23 Tawanda yesterday.

```
1
                 MR. SCOTT:
                              I'm sorry; I couldn't
 2
     hear.
 3
                 MR. LANGE: Tawanda knows what his
 4
     report is, and he --
 5
                 MR. SCOTT: Maybe it'd be better to
 6
     bounce it to the next meeting.
 7
                 MR. LANGE:
                              Okav.
 8
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a report
     from Comm. Garcia?
 9
10
                 MR. LANGE: Have you heard anything?
11
                 MS. HAYNES: That I don't know.
12
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And is there a
13
     report from Comm. Blackburn?
14
                 MS. HAYNES: No.
15
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Moving on, then,
16
     to Comm. Ramos.
17
                 COMM. RAMOS: In the case of Brummet
18
     versus Quality Team, I recommend that the
19
     Commission uphold the findings of the Commission.
20
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a second
21
    to the recommendation?
22
                 COMM. CRENSHAW: So moved.
23
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD:
                                     Is there a second?
```

```
1
                 COMM. GIDNEY: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah,
 2
     second.
 3
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor?
                 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
 4
 5
                 COMM. RAMOS: Aye.
 6
                 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
 7
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye.
 8
            Opposed?
 9
                       (No response.)
10
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And Comm. Gidney.
11
                 COMM. GIDNEY: In the case of O'Brien
12
     versus Calltech Communications, LLC, I move that
13
     we uphold the findings of the Commission.
14
                 COMM. RAMOS: I second it.
15
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor?
16
                 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye.
17
                 COMM. RAMOS: Aye.
18
                 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye.
19
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye.
20
            Opposed?
21
                      (No response.)
22
                 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And
23
    Comm. Crenshaw.
```

1 COMM. CRENSHAW: In the case of 2 Nicodemus versus Resort Condominiums 3 International, I move we uphold the findings of no probable cause. 4 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a second? 5 6 COMM. RAMOS: Second. 7 COMM. GIDNEY: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor? 9 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye. 10 COMM. RAMOS: Aye. 11 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye. 12 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye. 13 Opposed? 14 (No response.) 15 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And I have the case of McCray versus Wishard Health Services, 16 17 and I would recommend to the Commission that we 18 uphold the Director's finding of no probable 19 cause. Could I get a second -- or could I get a 20 motion? 21 COMM. GIDNEY: So moved. 22 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Is there a second? 23 COMM. CRENSHAW: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: All in favor? 2 COMM. CRENSHAW: Aye. 3 COMM. RAMOS: Aye. 4 COMM. GIDNEY: Aye. 5 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Aye. 6 Opposed? 7 (No response.) 8 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And I would like 9 to assign appeals cases for this coming month. 10 would like to move the case for Comm. Carter to 11 Comm. Ramos. If you would, take the case of 12 Tamika Wheeler versus Indianapolis Housing 13 Authority. 14 COMM. RAMOS: Sure. 15 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And for 16 Comm. Crenshaw, I would like to assign the case 17 Witherspoon versus Mike's Car Wash and 18 Witherspoon versus Indianapolis Police Department 19 and Witherspoon versus Integral Tech and 20 Witherspoon versus Security Video Indiana, if you 21 don't mind. 22 COMM. CRENSHAW: Not a problem. 23 (Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And for

Comm. Gidney, Locke versus Prestwick Golf Course.

Comm. Crenshaw, if you would like to be relieved of a couple of those cases, I will do those.

COMM. CRENSHAW: I'm -- I don't see a problem.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Okay. Thank you. Moving on to the Administrative Update.

MR. SCOTT: The Director's Report, and I would like to pass these up for each of the Commissioners. It's more of an outline, and for those members of the public, if any would like a copy, there are certainly some here.

MS. HAYNES: Thank you.

MR. SCOTT: And the first matter is to address the status of the new agency regulations, and I would ask that they be added as a matter of old business to the agenda for the December 15th meeting.

You have already been provided information for the September Commission meeting regarding the progress that had been made, and what we need

to do then is: Once the Commissioners are comfortable with the outline that has been provided, we then need to take it to the Office of Legislative Services, because we then have to go through the administrative process of having the rules announced, an opportunity for the public to receive that notice and to be able to comment on the proposed rules, before the Commission then acts to adopt those rules.

And I just want to make certain that the Commissioners are on board with the direction that the legal staff has been working, and so would like to have that added to our meeting's agenda next month, and hoping that everyone still has those materials, but if not, if you indicate so, we will send another copy of those materials to you.

And they are rules which would address unfair practices with respect to credit transactions, discrimination in places of public accommodations, discrimination against the disabled in places of public accommodations, a new and probably more comprehensive rule, which

1.5

1.8

would be preventing retaliation against a person who files a complaint, testifies before the Commission, or assists the Commission, in accord with the Indiana civil rights law, and then also review of civil remedies.

The second matter of report is: There is an ad hoc committee that is now meeting and has been meeting. I believe we advised the Commission of their existence, and it's, for lack of a better phrase right now, the Multicultural Committee and Annual Cultural Conference.

And they have been meeting monthly, and they have concluded at this point that they're going to attempt to hold a conference that will take place in several locations, perhaps even here in Richmond, that will address geographic and racial and ethnic diversity, and also provide for a sharing of information regarding cultures.

With respect to the Dr. Martin Luther

King, Jr. Indiana Holiday Commission, in our

statute, there is a provision, and if you look on

the third page of what I provided to you, you

will see the statutory language, and in

Section 4-23-24.1-7, in Section 7(a), the last sentence of that paragraph states that the expenses incurred under this subsection shall be paid out of funds appropriated to the Lieutenant Governor or the Civil Rights Commission. And I wanted to report to the Commissioners the status of this at this point in time.

The expenses that are being discussed are the costs, the per diem, as well as travel expenses, for members of the Dr. Martin Luther King Commission. I've had a meeting with the Lieutenant Governor's Office, and at least as of yesterday's -- I'm sorry -- last week's meeting, there was not only agreement, at least in principle, that the cost would be split 50/50 -- previously we carried that burden entirely, although we did receive some payments that assisted with that -- there also is, at least at this point, an agreement that the cost of the Martin Luther King Commemoration program might also be split 50/50.

So, I'm hoping on that one. Obviously the statutory language does not explicitly address

that program. At least at this point the Lieutenant Governor's Office was willing to discuss that, and I'm hoping that that will occur.

COMM. RAMOS: Is that an ongoing commitment?

MR. SCOTT: It's an ongoing -- I should give you a little bit of the background, because there has been some assistance that has occurred in the past. During the Kernan Lieutenant Governorship, there were funds that were applied to the cost of the Martin Luther King Commemoration ceremony. However, there is no record as to any agreement, nor any indication of any obligation for future planning, that contributions would continue.

So, where we are now is seeking agreement from Lieutenant Governor Skillman's Office that in fact there will be an agreement. We have arrived at at least one agreement, and that is that we will have in place a memorandum of understanding so that we have a written record of what is agreed to, and so that the parties can

understand what they would reasonably expect of each other.

COMM. RAMOS: And that's independent of who's in the office, politically speaking?

MR. SCOTT: Well, yes and no. At least we would have a written agreement.

Obviously when a new Lieutenant Governor comes into office, they can state that they no longer want to follow that agreement, but at least there will now be a record of what the agreement is.

We have no written record, other than a few indications of checks having been written, but no indication that there was an agreement as to how those funds would be applied, whether there would be an expectation that there would be funds available in the future.

COMM. RAMOS: Okay.

MR. SCOTT: So, we're moving ahead and, I think, making progress.

And then in with that I do want to mention that in our budget proposal, we will be seeking line-item funding from the state legislature for the activities of the Dr. Martin Luther King

Indiana Holiday Commission.

And as you know, it's not only the -well, I shouldn't say not only, but not just the
Dr. King ceremony, but we also use that
Commission to support the Holocaust observance,
and both programs come at not a great cost, but
an amount that it would be helpful to have some
support in funding that.

And then finally, the state budgeting process. In accord with the Governor's directions, we have already submitted material regarding our budgetary needs for the next two years, and I wanted to merely add that that is in process in the executive branch as we speak now.

And also indicate to you that we are seeking specific line-item funding for the Education Steering Committee, for the Dr. Martin Luther King Commission, and also for some additional efforts that we will be making in the work ahead for the Commission.

In particular, as you know, we have a youth summit. We wanted to expend that youth summit into a youth forum, where we have

continual contact with young people who are working through the auspices of the agency.

I think that completes my report.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Thank you.

Do we have a Deputy Director's Report?

MS. CDE BACA: Yes, we do. You have in your packet the monthly production report for the Indiana Civil Rights Commission. The total pending case inventory reported in September 2006 was 407 cases. During the month of October, we had 54 additions to that case -- or to that caseload.

Dispositions during that time were 18. I know that seems like a very low number, which it is. As you know, last month we reported over 70 dispositions. The reason that we have such a low number in October for dispositions is -- you may recall this as well -- that every year during the month of October, for six weeks, we cannot turn in cases to the EEOC because they do something nationally with their database.

So, these 18 cases were the housing cases and public accommodations cases, any other -- any

case other than employment cases that were turned in, and that's why that number is so low. We cannot submit employment cases again until actually starting on Monday.

So, during the month of November we expect that the dispositions will once again increase.

So, the total pending case inventory as of October 31st was 445. We also had one probable cause finding during that month.

With regard to the ADR unit, do you have the ADR case -- I don't believe you do.

(No response.)

MS. CDE BACA: We had -- there were a total of seven cases mediated during the month of October. Five of those resulted in settlement for closure, and we also have the benefit during this period of time of law students that have accepted -- been accepted as mediator interns, so Steve Tilden in the ADR unit has been very busy during the month of October.

And so, we had five successful settlements, and I think the majority of those were done by our interns, and I have to state

that the report from Steve Tilden was that this has been the best set of interns that he's ever had the opportunity to work with, so we're very pleased to have had their help during the month.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Thank you.

Are there any additional announcements?

(No response.)

none, I just want to say from this Chair that I appreciate the -- everything that the Human Rights Commission here in Richmond has done for us to make us comfortable and to be as generous as you could be. I do appreciate that. And I also appreciate Comm. Gidney for being the host from the city for the Commission.

Is there any other announcements?

COMM. RAMOS: The judge has --

MR. SCOTT: I think the only other matter -- and I don't know how the Chair wishes to handle it, but we did intend to provide the opportunity for public comments before the day is over.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: And now would be

the time.

Is there anyone who would like to make a comment about what they've witnessed today, or just a comment in general?

MR. SCOTT: And I would certainly like to recognize the Director for the Richmond Human Rights Commission, and ask that if he would mind making a comment and allowing the Commissioners to know what in particular your agency has been dealing with in this community as you provide the services that are so needed and necessary.

MR. CHAPPELL: Yes, sir. Well, first I want to thank you for choosing Richmond, our lovely city. We're very, very happy to be able to provide the accommodations, and I hope that you did find them comfortable and suitable for your needs.

We have a relatively small staff comparable of other agencies across the state, but I think they do a tremendous job. In fact, I want to ask our staff if they would stand. I think we're only missing one.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where is she?

MR. CHAPPELL: Rose there,

Mr. Church, Mrs. Satterfield, Mr. Dangerfield.

And then I have a couple of Commissioners here as well, I believe. The Chair, Mr. Hunter, and Josh Williams, and I think that's it, as far as representation of the Commission.

As you guys do, we deal with a lot of issues. I guess the preponderance of our cases have to do with the issues of race and employment. We see an increase in disability issues, and some issues in terms of sexual harassment. I think that would be the largest portion of what we do handle.

We are finding as we do our work that institutionalized discrimination has become much more subtle and covert, and practitioners have become very much more articulate in how they implement the factors and procedures, but as they become more articulate, so do we become more aware and more astute and more knowledgeable in terms of how to seek out that kind of information, so we've been very successful in

that regard.

We've instituted a public information awareness program, whereby we would go to various sections of the city and we make ourselves available to the community, and we, of course, give them a brief on the Commission, what it does, how it operates, and then we open it up for public input and comment.

What we've found is that a lot of people feel intimidated coming to the agency. A lot of it has to do with location. We happen to be located in the same building as the Police Department, so that's a deterrent for a lot of people to come. So, we felt that if we would go out into the areas where people live, that we'd get more input.

We have some new programs, so we haven't been able to make a real assessment in terms of the effectiveness of it yet, but we're hoping that that will pay off for us. It has -- just the announcement of it has increased the awareness of the existence of the Commission.

I was surprised, in the number of years

that we've been here, which has been since 1990, formally, the number of folks who really don't know about the Commission and what it does. And so, we're finding that this process -- we believe this process will help us out in terms of increasing awareness in the community.

2.0

I have a lot of support from my

Commission. They back us all of the way. I

think we're doing a pretty good job. Public

input, feedback that I'm getting, particularly

here of late, suggests that people are very

pleased that the Commission is being -- is

asserting itself and being more aggressive about

identifying areas where people are being

discriminated against and taking appropriate

action.

In fact, I had a comment just within the last hour or so about how an individual felt that we were not backing down from the issues, and so that's just our position and we plan to continue to operate in that manner.

Any questions that you'd like to ask me?

I can tell you this: Right now our caseload is

about 25. We have disposed of 14, I believe, this year. I believe that three were -- three were probable causes and the rest were no probable causes.

And sometimes people have a problem understanding that process as well, but we try to do our best to explain to them that, you know, you've got to have sufficient evidence and that to -- well, your evidence should be objective when you do your investigation, and then you make your finding based on what's there in the file.

So, anything that I might have missed? Better say it now while they're here.

(Laughter.)

MR. CHAPPELL: We won't get this chance again for a while.

COMM. RAMOS: I have a question for you.

MR. CHAPPELL: Sure.

COMM. RAMOS: From a standpoint across the state, but particularly in your area here, are you seeing incidents, either from a growing number of rights being addressed to you

from the Hispanic side or from the -- and I know 2 gay, bi and lesbian, you know, gender. Do you 3 see any issues in your area? 4 MR. CHAPPELL: From the Hispanic 5 side, but not formally. And again, a lot of 6 that, as I talk to people in the community, it 7 has to do with the location. That's why we 8 decided to implement this program, and I believe 9 our next presentation will be in the area that is 10 predominantly inhabited by the Hispanic 11 community. So, we'll see what happens with that. 12 COMM. RAMOS: Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Charles? 14 COMM. GIDNEY: (Shook head no.) 15 MS. CDE BACA: I have a question for 16 you. 17 MR. CHAPPELL: Sure. 18 MS. CDE BACA: When you find probable 19 cause, what -- I mean, you know, with us, it then 20 can go through our administrative process through 21 Judge Lange. When you find probable cause, then 22 what happens?

MR. CHAPPELL: We find probable

cause, we send a notice to the respondent and the charging party informing them of that. We initially try to work a consent agreement between the two. If that's successful, then everybody's home free. If not, then a hearing has to be scheduled, and then I would get the case to a hearing officer that's paid for by the city.

MS. CDE BACA: Oh, okay.

MR. CHAPPELL: And then the hearing officer would render his finding.

CHAIRMAN BAYNARD: Thank you very much. Is there anything else?

COMM. RAMOS: I have a question for Deputy Director Cde Baca. Do you have an update on some of the education stuff? You know I have a passion for that.

MS. CDE BACA: Some of the education activities are that -- I mean I think -- well, I guess here in Richmond you probably don't know, but we do have an active Indiana Civil Rights

Commission Education Steering Committee. We have had one full meeting of the Committee that occurred September the 12th.

We are having our next full Committee

meeting -- and this -- the Committee consists of

members statewide. A couple of our Commissioners

are on the Committee. We have legislators, state

legislators, on the Committee, we have community

members, superintendents from various school

districts across the state, members from colleges

and universities across the state, including IU,

Purdue, Ball State, University of Indianapolis,

Indiana State University.

Because within our statutes, it does call for the Indiana Civil Rights Commission to collaborate and work with these groups, the Department of Education, to study the origins of prejudice and discrimination, and then, you know, hopefully, eventually eliminate all of that.

The first area that the Committee is working on is with regard to disparities and inequities in the education system, specifically with regard to discipline. So, we have a couple of different ideas and plans of action of how we're going to proceed with that, but as I said, our next full committee meeting is January

the 23rd.

And we've been working specifically a lot with the researchers from IU, because, as you know, they've done a lot of research and produced a lot of papers on equity issues and discipline issues with the school -- various school systems across the state.

MR. CHAPPELL: Similarly, our ordinance does provide for us to be able to do something of a similar nature. We've attempted to do that on a couple of occasion, and we've met with a lot of resistance, hostile resistance at that, and so we've been, I guess, kind of rehashing how we might approach accomplishing that task, but we want to do the same thing.

MS. CDE BACA: Well, I think with us, what the -- and I have to tell you, with the assistance of -- I have -- there's a member of our staff who is our education specialist, and she has only been on board for about six months, and has just come in and really kind of taken the bulls by the horn with regard to that and assisted me in approaching all of the people that

I just mentioned.

I think the main thing that -- why we've been successful and why we have had such interest is that we're not the Department of Education, so when we approach the school districts, it's not that "We're here telling you what you have to do, but we want to come to the table. We want everyone to come to the table and feel like they have a voice at the table so that we can address these various issues."

And -- but bottom line is, you know, everywhere we go and every person that we meet with, the first thing that we say is, "Education is a civil right," and when you have people from the Department of Education saying, "Well, I never realized that was in your statute, and -- but we're so glad you're here" --

MR. CHAPPELL: Uh-huh.

MS. CDE BACA: -- then that makes us feel like we know we're doing the right thing.

MR. CHAPPELL: Right.

MS. CDE BACA: So -- but it is -- you know, oftentimes it is just, you know, baby